

97-84116-27

Dietrich, John Hassler

After prohibition - What?

Minneapolis, Minn.

[1933]

97-84116-27

MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
PRESERVATION DIVISION

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308

Z

Box 460

Dietrich, John Hassler, 1878- 1957

... After prohibition -- What? (By, John D.

Dietrich ... Minneapolis, Minn., The First  
Unitarian society, 1933,p. 129-143. (The Humanist pulpit, series  
XVI, no. 9)

"An address delivered before the First Unitarian society of Minneapolis, at its regular Sunday morning meeting, October 22, 1933."

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

## TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 9:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA IIA IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 6/10/97

INITIALS: JLM

TRACKING # :

25268

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Bd

# The Humanist Pulpit

---

Series XVI

No. 9

---

## After Prohibition-- What?



308

Z

Box 460

JOHN H. DIETRICH

Price Ten Cents

The First Unitarian Society  
1526 Harmon Place  
Minneapolis, Minn.

This pamphlet contains an address delivered before the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, at its regular Sunday morning meeting, October 22, 1933, by the minister, John H. Dietrich, and is published for the purpose of reaching those people who are in sympathy with our work but are unable to attend our meetings.

---

The minister of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis is granted absolute freedom of thought and speech. The Sunday morning addresses are the expression of his individual convictions and he alone is responsible for them.

---

Twelve addresses are published during the church year from September to June, and subscriptions for the annual series are received at one dollar postpaid. If in addition the Sunday morning programs are desired, the subscription price for the two (addresses and programs) is two dollars. Address the Secretary, First Unitarian Society, 1526 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, Minn.

---

Extra copies of this pamphlet and all others that are still in print may be procured from the above address for ten cents each, postpaid.

---

Mr. Dietrich's addresses are broadcast over WDGY. 1180 Kilocycles—254.1 Meters.

---



## After Prohibition--What?

It is a long time since I have talked on the liquor problem, but I have a very definite recollection of the reaction to my remarks. It was the same reaction that I get to almost every discussion, but prohibition being a very nettling problem at that time, it was somewhat intensified. The reaction, of which I speak, was well illustrated in a recent cartoon in a New York paper, which pictured an harassed editor clinging to the top of a smokestack. He appeared quite imperturbable. From his typewriter issued forth an editorial on "The League of Nations."irate looking individuals were climbing through the roof of the building below and crying execrations on the head of the poor editor. One accused him of being a "biased democrat," another called him a "dirty republican," another shouted "spineless jelly-fish." The title of the cartoon was "The Editor who tried to run an Independent Non-partisan Newspaper."

A liberal may be defined as a person who attempts to be as scientific in the field of human affairs as in the realm of astronomy, physics, and chemistry. He strives to be free from party or class bias; to regard not only the facts which square with his convictions, but those which run counter to them. He regards all social movements as experimentations. He is ready, and even eager, to alter his convictions if new facts require it. Above all, he is willing to remain in a state of suspended judgment when the facts do not point clearly to a definite conviction. It is in this spirit that I try to approach all problems, and frequently I do

not gain the approbation of the extremists and the dogmatists on either side. And most people, of course, are either for or against a thing. Especially is this true of the liquor problem. And I have had little to say, because really I did not have any definite conviction in the matter.

On the basis of principle, I have never been in favor of prohibition, and yet, being well aware of the terrific evils connected with the misuse of alcoholic liquors, I was willing and glad to have it tried. When I say that on principle I have never believed in prohibition, I mean that my whole theory of life is based upon freedom and temperance as the way to moral progress. I do not believe that the morally strong should be restricted for the sake of the morally weak. The latter should be dealt with in some other way. I believe in the fullness and abundance of life, and what could be more precious to this than freedom and self-respect? But prohibition is built primarily upon disrespect for human personality and a denial of moral freedom. To deny the right and power of man to exercise moral choice in personal matters is to demonstrate lack of faith in mankind. Temperance, as the way of life which points to the right use of all things, is a doctrine of fulfillment; so I have always believed in temperance, temperance in all things, as a doctrine which respects the individual and his liberty, which challenges the individual to moral development, which leaves to the state the control of the intemperate weakling without coercing the morally capable. No real moral progress will be made so long as morality depends solely upon outward legal restrictions. It can come only from that freedom within, which permits people to gain self-control through education and discipline.

#### I.

But the question is no longer that of prohibition—prohibition is a lost cause. And in spite of what I have just said, I am somewhat disappointed. While opposed to it on principle, I had hopes for it as a practical measure. In other words, I felt that prohibition as a method of social control was worth trying. Knowing, of course, that men

cannot be made good by legislation, I still felt that society had a right to say to certain individuals, "You shall not drink yourself into a state of intoxication where you are a menace on the highway, or into an institution where the rest of us are forced to support you and your children. We will try to prevent your doing so, even if it means robbing others of their rightful privileges."

Alcohol has always been one of the greatest enemies of the human race, and men have tried various ways of regulating and controlling it. One of these ways was prohibition, almost peculiarly an American movement. A graph might easily be drawn, showing the rise and fall of the prohibition movement. It really began in 1846 when Maine went dry. Until 1880 very little was done. From that date until 1900 many states in the Middle West appeared in the prohibition column. From 1900 to 1915 one southern state after another adopted prohibition legislation, as did many far western states until thirty states in all had become dry. Then in 1919 the Eighteenth Amendment, bringing federal prohibition, was adopted. The peak of enforcement came in 1921 when the law really demonstrated its effectiveness; but from 1921 onward we see the line declining with increasing rapidity until the Wickersham report appeared in 1931. Since then the line has fallen precipitately, with the most remarkable reversal of public opinion, in a short time, that I have ever seen. If you had asked me two years ago I would have said that there was absolutely no chance of getting two-thirds of the states to vote for repeal, and yet today almost two-thirds have voted and not a single one has voted against repeal.

With the declining effectiveness of enforcement there has been an increase in the evils which have resulted from prohibition. It is difficult to say whether or not these evils overbalance the good. There have been good results from prohibition, especially as regards the conditions among the wage-earning classes. Much money, formerly spent in saloons, found its way into savings banks and the purchase of commodities. The workmen were steadier, stronger, more

alert, and more efficient. Perhaps Andre Siegfried, the French author of *America Comes of Age*, sums it up best. He sneers at prohibition and declares that it is impossible to enforce it. Yet he states, "The great mass of the people are undoubtedly benefiting in health, working efficiency, and increased wages. . . . The Eighteenth Amendment has done its share in raising the standard of living of the American workman to the highest level that the world has ever seen."

But prohibition has brought in its wake several alarming evils. It has created an enormous illicit business—the industry of bootlegging—which recently attained the position of a major American enterprise, second only to the automobile industry in Detroit. Another evil following in the wake of prohibition is an extensive spirit of lawlessness. It was inevitable that disrespect for one American law should lead to disrespect for other laws. A third evil is the corruption of federal and state officials. Investigations have shown a vast interlocking system of the most pernicious sort, in which bootleggers and high-jackers have gained control of officials and courts by bribes amounting to millions of dollars. Another evil is the harm it has done to the temperance movement, which had made great progress in the years preceding prohibition. Temperance education was practically abandoned after prohibition came. A movement toward sobriety was increasing with each year as the Twentieth Century pushed toward the end of its second decade, but with prohibition the temperance movement was forgotten, and our young people have grown up with little knowledge of the evils of alcoholism. When I was a young man, drinking was considered a social disgrace, but today it is the smart and proper thing to do.

## II.

But it is useless to hold post-mortems. The important thing for believers in sobriety now is to admit the defeat of prohibition, and start out on a new plan. There has been a mad rush to get on the wet bandwagon; but the rush has been a thoughtless one, for few have stopped to

consider what direction the bandwagon would take, and how far it is likely to go. With a similar lack of thought we stumbled into the error of the last twelve years. Engrossed by the war, we were stampeded into the mistake of going to an unwise extreme; and now engrossed by the depression, we are in danger of making a worse mistake in the other direction. Is it not possible for us to find a reasonable solution, or is our country one which insists on being extremist, and then slowly and painfully paying for its mistakes? I remember that Prof. Munsterberg, in speaking of prohibition years ago, told us that this was true of Americans. Perhaps he was right.

Up until now prohibitionists have opposed consistently every suggestion that any form of regulation be substituted, partly because they refused to admit that their "noble experiment" was imperfect, and partly because any alternative would be illegal under the Eighteenth Amendment, which specifies prohibition as the sole method of dealing with the problem. But now the whole situation has changed. Prohibition is about to be repealed, but this by no means solves the age-old problem. As Senator Capper has aptly said, "We may repeal prohibition, but we cannot repeal the liquor problem." In fact, it has become more of a problem than ever. The repeal simply throws the problem back into the hands of the states. Some of these have retained the old prohibition laws, others have repealed them, and many never had any. So in all probability the traffic will be legalized in most states. The question is: Will this traffic be uncontrolled or controlled? Those who look upon it as a potential menace can no longer choose between prohibition and regulation. They are forced by the necessity of the case to choose between intelligent regulation and a liquor deluge. One hardly dares contemplate the social consequences of the latter.

We need at this critical juncture an open mind and a scientific spirit as well as a social conscience. To declare that regulation will not regulate, as some of the prohibitionists insist, is the counsel of despair. We must recognize the need of a long and often disappointing series of experiments

in liquor control. Measures which might operate with some success in one state may prove utterly futile in another. In any case, whatever plan is adopted, it must have the support of the people. A large minority opposition can wreck any law, which, to be effective, must be the articulate organ of the desires of living men. But even in this probable era of experimentation we must hold in mind certain objectives, which I shall mention in a moment. There is no time to be lost. Repeal is imminent. Constructive regulatory legislation must come mainly from former drys who recognize the evils of the traffic and yet see that prohibition is a lost cause. We need leadership desperately if the brewers and distillers are not to have their own sweet way, as they had in the good old days. A wise general knows when he is defeated, conducts a strategic retreat, and digs in on a new line. The new line is not prohibition, but regulation. Already there are functioning in ten states, including our own, official control boards for the study of the problems which repeal will present. I presume the members of these boards represent every possible phase of opinion, out of which should arise some kind of control suited to the American temperament.

I believe that there is a solution for the liquor problem—a solution that will allow a sane and moderate use of alcohol to those who desire it, and at the same time minimize the evils of excess. There is no unanimity of opinion as to what that solution shall be, but the people are in an adventurous mood here as in other realms of activity. There is no reason why we must follow the old pre-prohibition route. Why is it not possible to strike out into a fresh trail? If in relation to every other business, new social and political controls are daily being devised why, in relation to this liquor business, should we not create a new technique, a new method, by which it can be brought within the compass of what the public really desires and by which the major evils of alcoholism can be eliminated?

### III.

While it does not lie within my province to outline in detail a plan for the control and regulation of the liquor

traffic, I said a moment ago that there are certain objectives which we must keep in mind in the formulation of any plan, and these I would mention now. The one big objective, of course, toward which all others are directed, is to reduce the consumption of alcoholic liquors to a minimum and to eliminate all the evils which flow from their excessive consumption. And to this end, I should say that there are at least four objectives which we must hold ever before us. First, the saloon, or anything approaching it in form and method, must not come back; second, liquor advertising must be prohibited; third, there must be public control of the profits of the industry; fourth, education for temperance must be resumed and carried on in home and school and church, persistently and effectively.

First, the saloon as it existed in pre-prohibition days, was a dreadful menace to society, and must never be allowed to return. And for the removal of this menace to our public life, prohibition must be given credit. I doubt if we had ever gotten rid of the saloon in any other way, and this banishing of the saloon is almost enough to justify any law. But now we must see that it stays banished. Behind its blinds degradation and crime were fostered, and under its principle of stimulated sales, poverty and drunkenness, big profits and political graft found a secure foothold. Those of us who are old enough have not forgotten the evils hatched by this disreputable institution, and we do not intend that it shall worm its way back into our social life. Despite the reaction from the Eighteenth Amendment, America is in no mood to stand any aggressiveness on the part of the brewers, the distillers, and the liquor trade generally, as that attitude was given expression through the saloon. The memory of their campaigns against temperance, of their corrupt legislative activities, and of their insolent intrusion in our political life in the days before prohibition, is still alive. Any indication that they are once more pushing their business in violation of decent social standards will bring the pendulum swinging back again. This is what a friend of mine had in mind the other day when he said that the answer to my question, "After prohibition—what?" was "Prohibition."

In the second place, liquor advertising must be prohibited. When I was a young man, I think that about half the advertising in newspapers and magazines and billboards were liquor advertisements. Personally, I do not pay much attention to advertising, but it evidently has a tremendous effect in stimulating sales and consumption of goods, else the millions of dollars used in that way would not be spent. And remembering that our main object is to reduce the consumption of alcoholic liquors, advertising must be eliminated. The great majority of Americans aspire to be a temperate nation, and they have a desire that young people shall be protected against the greedy commercialization of the liquor trade and the pitfalls of intemperance. They dread the hazards and inefficiencies that attend immorality, and they are well aware of all the evils which follow in the train of excesses; and they must be prepared to take drastic steps if, as a result of the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, conditions should once more get beyond their control. And one of the first steps to take in this direction is to prevent the advertising of liquor in any form whatsoever.

The third objective is the elimination of the profit motive, for only as this is eliminated is there any hope of controlling the liquor traffic in the interest of a decent society. To approach the problem from any other angle is only to tinker with it and insure failure. This point cannot be too heavily stressed. Just how it is to be handled, I leave to the experts. It might be done, for instance, by a government monopoly of the liquor traffic, or by fixing very definitely the return to the brewers and distillers, and all profits in excess of this limited amount to go into the federal treasury.

This naturally brings up the question of governmental revenues from the sale of liquors. The present position of the government is discouraging, to say the least. President Roosevelt asked for the legalization of beer to "provide therefrom a proper and needed revenue" and promised, after repeal, to eliminate other taxes. It is estimated that billions of dollars will flow into the coffers of the government, and thereby balance our budget, which we have not

been able otherwise to balance. The argument seems to be that the great government of the United States should profit from the intemperance of its citizens. That is a dangerous and immoral position to take. The idea of every government should be to derive as little revenue as possible from the drinking habits of its citizens, and the obligation is the greater for a government which has said for twelve years that its citizens should have no liquor at all. The primary object of taxation should be, not revenue, but social control. Taxes should be levied, not with the idea of filling the public treasury at whatever cost to public morality and efficiency, but as a method of reducing the consumption of alcohol. Prices to the consumer must be so scaled as to discourage consumption, particularly of hard liquor, and to attempt this governments must tax or fix prices. But the revenue side ought not to be stressed. If they want to stress it, however, let them be logical and say that the government should take all the profit rather than simply the proceeds of taxation. In that way the revenues should be larger, and—this is more important—there would be eliminated the great vice of a legalized commercialization of the liquor traffic, which is the parent of a large progeny of different evils.

On this basis then, what form of liquor control should be attempted? I am not in a position to say definitely. It may be that there are a number of schemes which would promise to achieve the desired end. If so, they should be brought forward and discussed. One kind of such control was proposed by Mr. Henry W. Anderson, a dissenting Wickersham Commissioner, and another is being described by Mr. Raymond Fosdick and Mr. Albert Scott, who have made a study of the problem under the auspices of Mr. Rockefeller. Both of these plans would have the government monopolize the liquor traffic and take the private profit out of it. They differ as to method, but the purpose is the same, and either of them merit careful consideration by the various states as well as by the Federal Congress. In any case, the profits should be entirely eliminated from the traffic, and prices should be scaled so as to reduce consumption, but should not be so high as to make bootlegging profit-



able. The revenues resulting from such a scale of prices should be taken by the government and devoted to objects which are connected with the harmful use of liquor, principally in education for temperance.

In connection with this, I think temperance would be promoted by making a distinction between intoxicating and non-intoxicating beverages, permitting comparative freedom in the sale and use of the latter, with rigid restrictions on the former. Such a plan would direct its attack against alcohol in the forms most liable to abuse by man, and, by permitting relative freedom in the use of the weaker drinks, tend to promote temperance. Just where the line should be drawn it is hard to say, but at present it has been set at 3.2 per cent. Wherever it is drawn, the weaker beverages might be sold in bottles for outside consumption, as beer is today, in grocery stores and drugstores, and so forth, and sold by the glass in hotels and restaurants and all places where meals are served. I believe this general accessibility of drinks with a low alcoholic content at a moderate price would greatly reduce the desire for stronger drinks, which cause most of the trouble.

In connection with this, a careful study should be made of the liquor regulations in other countries. I doubt if any of these should be adopted *in toto* for our country, but we should be well acquainted with the experiences of other peoples, and by taking the best from various systems we may arrive at a liquor control well adapted to American life. Nearly all the suggestions I have made are to be found in one country or another. For instance, Sweden and Norway limit the profits of their government-regulated hard liquor distilleries. All profits over six per cent are returned to the government. In Canada all liquor profits, in some provinces, and in others all profits above six per cent, go to the government, and are spent variously on public health, temperance education, and on what in certain counties is called "the rehabilitation of drunkards." There are no saloons in Norway. To buy liquor you go to a government store, whose salaried clerk does not use "high pressure" salesmanship. The Quebec plan involves what I suggested a

moment ago. Wine and beer may be bought there with meals in restaurants or hotels, but hard liquor may be had only in bottled form in government-operated stores, for consumption off the premises. In some Canadian Provinces, and in Sweden, the individual buyer is licensed, and in purchasing liquor for home use in Sweden the applicant must state whether his taxes have been paid, how many there are in the family, how much he entertains, and so forth. To those whose answers are satisfactory a permit is issued for the purpose of only as much liquor as the answers indicate they need. And this permit is revoked for drunkenness. I doubt if our people would back up any one of these systems in the exact form in which it is operated in other countries, sufficiently to make it enforceable here. Before we prescribe for Americans, we should try to find out exactly what they want and what they will support. There is no use in having regulation of any kind which the people do not want and will not support. We have learned that by sad experience.

#### IV.

This brings me to my last point, namely: the need of education for temperance. Whether any progress can be made through the law or not, sound and sure progress is certainly possible along the path of education for temperance. If ninety per cent of the people of the country were temperate by habit and conviction and had learned how to use all things in moderation, the enforcement of prohibition would have presented no difficulty, neither will the problem of regulation. Regardless of what laws you have, there will be no sound advance until the will of the people free to control itself from within is again enlisted in support of self-discipline through a long process of education. Hence, whatever kind of regulation we have, temperance must move on or we are on the downward path.

The late Prof. Rauschenbush, a keen writer on social problems, used to compare progress to a cart being drawn uphill. Education is the horse which does the pulling; legislation is the stone which now and then one puts be-

hind the wheel to prevent the cart from slipping. After the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment we unhitched the horse (education), hoping that somehow the stone (legislation) would take on also the business of pulling. In consequence, the oncoming generation is ignorant concerning certain facts about alcohol. Now that regulation of some sort is about to be substituted for prohibition, the problem again becomes in the main one for the individual to solve. Some people, of course, maintain that education cannot avail in such matters—young people must learn only through experience. But that is absurd. The chief function of education is to save youth from unnecessary and often disastrous experiment. One does not need to permit his son to smash an automobile into a tree in order that the boy may learn to drive. I therefore advocate a scientific, fact presenting, unemotional system of temperance education for our younger generation. Much of the old temperance education was not always truthful, was usually too partisan, and at times even hysterical.

We are living in the most scientific age the world has ever known. Our colleges and our government furnish our citizens with precise facts as to how to grow corn, how to enrich the soil, how to raise a baby, vitamins, balanced diets, and so forth. Why cannot this fact-finding be extended to the effects of alcohol upon the human body? These facts are already taught in the public schools and state colleges of Sweden. And in Russia, where drink seems to be as little restricted as in any nation, the Russians maintain that great progress has been made toward sobriety because of their educational campaigns—the newspapers, the radio, and the motion picture all educate the people on the alcoholic effects upon efficiency and health. And reviewing the control systems, which work so well in other countries, we find that in all these countries a large part of control rests upon a continued and untiring system of temperance education.

So I believe that education should be the first step toward control in our own country. A bureau, perhaps connected with the Alcoholic Control Board, if such a board should be established, where research shall be conducted continu-

ally into the aspects of drink, and the facts continually told to our citizens, and particularly to our boys and girls, should serve an excellent purpose. The most effective prohibition of all is the prohibition that is fostered by education and discipline and self-control. And while I advocate a fact-finding bureau and scientific education, there are even now several fundamental facts concerning alcoholic beverages which are generally admitted. For parents to permit young people to go out into the modern world without knowledge of these facts is criminal. They have recently been pointed out by an authority and I would repeat them here.

1. Alcohol is a drug which, even in moderate but regular doses, tends to slow down the body-brain machine and lower resistance to disease. How common it is to hear a doctor say, "So and so might have recovered from that attack of pneumonia if he had not been a steady drinker." Scores of laboratory investigations show that alcohol is not a stimulant but a narcotic. Even small doses may cut down one's mental efficiency. Dr. Mayo tells us that through alcoholic stimulation a man gradually loses his mental coordination and eventually his command over his own life and his own destiny.

2. Alcoholic beverages tend to weaken one's power of inhibition. A girl under the influence of even a small amount of liquor should look at herself in a mirror. She would find that the sparkle in her eyes has become an unlovely sort of glitter; her mouth has grown heavy and hard. Ugliness has usurped the place of beauty. But that is not the worst of it. She does things which would bring the tingle of shame if fully possessed of her faculties. The new psychology plainly shows that our inner stability, and therefore our happiness, depends upon the degree of control over our primitive urges. Crises come—especially in the lives of young people—when one's future happiness or unhappiness depends upon self-control, and the presence or absence of even a small amount of liquor in one's system may determine the issue.

3. Alcohol is a habit-forming narcotic drug. To class intemperance in the use of alcohol with intemperance in the

consumption of food, as many do, is absurd. In the use of alcohol, the tendency to repeat the dose in increasing quantities and at more frequent intervals is always present, and no one can be sure that he has the power successfully to resist it. Once formed, the liquor habit is a serious handicap in the battle for success in any vocation and in the struggle for moral stability.

4. The use of alcohol is in this machine age a serious social menace. Life has been speeded up and has become interdependent to a much greater degree than it was before prohibition. A noted London investigator reports, "If we could eliminate the moderate drinker from the road, we should eliminate four-fifths of the traffic hazards due to drink." And Prof. Carver of Harvard says, "The man who is only one-fourth drunk is a very uncertain person. He will do unpredictable things to the danger of everyone. If he lived alone it would be different, but in a great factory, in a crowded street, or anywhere in an interlocking civilization, he is a very undependable creature, and therefore a menace."

5. The practice of drinking tends to bring in its train dire social consequences. A prominent social worker writes, "Alcohol is the immediate cause of about ten per cent of our insanity; is an operating factor in about twenty-four per cent of the families reporting to organized charity; the court of Domestic Relations in Chicago finds that over forty per cent of their broken homes connect with alcohol; the Committee of Fifty found forty-five per cent of children annually deserted or neglected have intemperate parents or guardians; drink is the first cause in thirty-one per cent of crimes, an indirect cause in fifty per cent."

Even these facts, indelibly impressed upon the minds of our young people, should go a long way toward the control of the liquor problem. And this becomes a very personal problem. Epictetus, somewhere in his discourses, tells us that a carpenter does not spend his energies on giving dissertations on the art of building, but buys a piece of land, erects a house, and thus shows himself master of his craft. Ultimately, education is not a matter of precept but of ex-

ample. What matters most is the manner in which each of us answers in his conduct the question of liquor control.

At the end let me ask briefly, what should be the attitude of the church in helping solve the alcohol problem? The church is a social organization whose task is the development of the noblest living, both individual and social, in the presence of religious experience. To this end the church must now turn to this field of education and insist in season and out that not only the church, but the home, the school, and the university instruct youth in the recognized facts concerning alcohol. The chief task of the church, however, is inspirational. Men and women are swayed not only by ideas but by attitudes. Reinhold says, "Religion exalts personality in a seemingly impersonal world." This is the attitude we must create increasingly. In such an atmosphere people welcome instinctively whatever conduces to the development of character and condemn what blasts or destroys it. Convince a normal person in his heart of the worth of possessing any decent habit and he will try to possess it. I think, after all, the only ultimate solution of the alcohol problem lies not in the sphere of politics, but in the realm of personal relationships. Self-control, like religion, spreads primarily through the contagion of character. It was this principle which prompted Felix Adler to lay down as the basis of all morality the precept, "So act as to elicit the best in others and thereby in thyself." And long before, the same idea was taught by Shakespeare when he wrote—

"Be noble! and the nobleness that lies  
In other men, sleeping, but never dead,  
Will rise in a majesty to meet thine own."

And alcohol would not even be a problem if every man and woman based his life on the qualities which Tennyson attributes to the goddess of wisdom, and which are the basis of all the human virtues: "Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control."

## **A Brief Synopsis of Several of the Addresses Listed on the Next Page**

### **THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT**

This pamphlet is considered by those who know the literature of the Co-operative Movement as one of the best expositions of Co-operation that has ever been written. When one has read it he will be acquainted with the history of the movement, with its ideals and purposes, and with the way it works in practical life. It has been bought and distributed by the thousands by various co-operative societies. "Intelligent co-operation is the economic hope of the world."

### **SHOULD CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BE RESTORED?**

This address covers the whole question of capital punishment, reviewing the history of the death sentence, giving the reasons why it had almost disappeared and why at this time there is agitation for its restoration. It also analyzes the problem of punishment, and advocates that the punitive idea be replaced by the same scientific attitude toward crime that society has taken with respect to the elimination of physical disease.

### **WHY RECOGNIZE RUSSIA?**

A search for conditions which will make it possible for the United States and Russia not only to live together in the same world but to co-operate in the great work that still remains to be done for the larger liberation of mankind. A survey of why the United States has refused recognition to Russia, why this recognition should be granted at this time, and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

### **WHAT IS REVOLUTION?**

Most people are afraid of revolution because they have a misconception of what revolution is—based on the unplanned and chaotic revolutions of the past. The relation of revolution to evolution. Recognizing revolution, as an abrupt stage, in a constantly changing society. What kind shall we have—planless and violent, or deliberate and orderly?

## **A Brief Synopsis of Several of the Addresses Listed on the Next Page**

### **THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT**

This pamphlet is considered by those who know the literature of the Co-operative Movement as one of the best expositions of Co-operation that has ever been written. When one has read it he will be acquainted with the history of the movement, with its ideals and purposes, and with the way it works in practical life. It has been bought and distributed by the thousands by various co-operative societies. "Intelligent co-operation is the economic hope of the world."

### **SHOULD CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BE RESTORED?**

This address covers the whole question of capital punishment, reviewing the history of the death sentence, giving the reasons why it had almost disappeared and why at this time there is agitation for its restoration. It also analyzes the problem of punishment, and advocates that the punitive idea be replaced by the same scientific attitude toward crime that society has taken with respect to the elimination of physical disease.

### **WHY RECOGNIZE RUSSIA?**

A search for conditions which will make it possible for the United States and Russia not only to live together in the same world but to co-operate in the great work that still remains to be done for the larger liberation of mankind. A survey of why the United States has refused recognition to Russia, why this recognition should be granted at this time, and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

### **WHAT IS REVOLUTION?**

Most people are afraid of revolution because they have a misconception of what revolution is—based on the unplanned and chaotic revolutions of the past. The relation of revolution to evolution. Recognizing revolution, as an abrupt stage, in a constantly changing society. What kind shall we have—planless and violent, or deliberate and orderly?

**HAVE YOU READ THESE ADDRESSES  
BY MR. DIETRICH?**

- ☐ My Religion
- ☐ What Is An Atheist?
- ☐ Is Atheism a Menace?
- ☐ Who Are These Fundamentalists?
- ☐ Thomas Paine
- ☐ Robert G. Ingersoll—An Appreciation
- ☐ What Happens to a College Student's Religion?
- ☐ What's Wrong with the Younger Generation?
- ☐ The Myth of a Superior Race
- ☐ The Superstition of Sin
- ☐ The Conspiracy of Silence About Sex
- ☐ What If the World Went Humanist?
- ☐ New Bibles for Old
- ☐ New Universes for Old
- ☐ The Ethics of Birth Control
- ☐ Religion in Russia
- ☐ Is the Universe Friendly or Unfriendly?
- ☐ Shall We Pray?
- ☐ The Control of Worry
- ☐ Can the God-Idea Be Saved?
- ☐ The Long, Long Trail
- ☐ Should Radicals Be Suppressed?
- ☐ Substitutes for Old Beliefs—or What Does Humanism  
Give in Place of What It Takes Away?
- ☐ Has the Pope Settled the Marriage Problem?
- ☐ Humanism—The Hope of the World
- ☐ Shall We Believe In Immortality?
- ☐ The Growing Literature of Humanism
- ☐ What's Happening to Religion
- ☐ Shall the Nations Disarm?
- ☐ When Death Comes
- ☐ What Is Revolution?
- ☐ Personal Beliefs of Noted Men
- ☐ The Need of a Plan
- ☐ Our Bewildered Young People
- ☐ Has Jesus a Message for Today?
- ☐ Fifty Years of Pioneering
- ☐ Grounds for Hope in the Present Chaos
- ☐ The Religion of "Green Pastures"
- ☐ Do Humanists Worship?
- ☐ Individualism vs. Socialism
- ☐ The New Paganism
- ☐ Is The Family Doomed?
- ☐ Should Capital Punishment Be Restored?
- ☐ The Co-operative Movement
- ☐ Why Jews Are Persecuted.
- ☐ Why Recognize Russia?
- ☐ After Prohibition—What?

Price 10c per copy, special price in quantities. Address,  
First Unitarian Society, Publication Dept., 1526 Harmon  
Place, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Enclosed find \$\_\_\_\_\_   
for which kindly send me the pamphlets checked.

MSH 25268

**END OF  
TITLE**